

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 EDWARD STROUGHTER, JR.,

Case No. 2:19-cv-02021-GMN-DJA

4 Plaintiff

ORDER

5 v.

6 WASHOE COUNTY JAIL,

7 Defendant
8

9 This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
10 by a prisoner in the custody of the Nevada Department of Corrections (“NDOC”). On
11 December 4, 2019, this Court issued an order denying the Plaintiff’s application to
12 proceed *in forma pauperis*, without prejudice, because the application was incomplete.
13 (ECF No. 3 at 1). The Court ordered Plaintiff to file a fully complete application to proceed
14 *in forma pauperis*, on the correct form with complete financial attachments in compliance
15 with 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) or pay the full filing fee of \$400 within thirty days from the date
16 of that order. (*Id.* at 2). The thirty-day period has now expired, and Plaintiff has not filed
17 another application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, paid the full filing fee, or otherwise
18 responded to the Court’s order.

19 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the
20 exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . .
21 dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831
22 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party’s failure
23 to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.
24 See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for
25 noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir.
26 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of
27 complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal
28 for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of

1 address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming
2 dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
3 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with
4 local rules).

5 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
6 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
7 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
8 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
9 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
10 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
11 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

12 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
13 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
14 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
15 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
16 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
17 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
18 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
19 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
20 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
21 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779
22 F.2d at 1424. The Court's order requiring Plaintiff to file another application to proceed
23 *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee within thirty days expressly stated: "IT IS
24 FURTHER ORDERED that if Plaintiff does not timely comply with this order, dismissal of
25 this action may result." (ECF No. 3 at 2). Thus, Plaintiff had adequate warning that
26 dismissal would result from his noncompliance with the Court's order to file another
27 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee within thirty days.


28 ///

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that this action is DISMISSED WITHOUT
2 PREJUDICE based on Plaintiff's failure to file a fully complete application to proceed *in*
3 *forma pauperis* or pay the full filing fee in compliance with this Court's December 4, 2019,
4 order.

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court will close the case and enter
6 judgment accordingly.

7 DATED this 10 day of January, 2020.

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
United States District Court